

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. Claims 1-33 stand rejected. In light of the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 14, 15, 20-22, 28-30, 32, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,067,082 (“Enmei”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,465 (“Yoshioka”). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. The prior art references must also teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim in question. See, M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). A reference can only be used for what it clearly discloses or suggests. See, In re Hummer, 113 U.S.P.Q. 66 (C.C.P.A. 1957); In re Stencel, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Here, the references, whether taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention claimed by the Applicant.

The Office Action asserts that the “area specification means for specifying a destination image area within an image displayed on said display” recited in claim 1 is disclosed in Figure 69; the limitation “specifying a destination image area within said displayed image” recited in claim 9 is shown in Figure 69; the limitation “specifying a desired area within an image display corresponding to said image data”

recited in claim 15 is shown in Figure 69; the limitation “area specification unit configured to allow a user to specify a desired area within the image displayed on said display unit” recited in claim 21 is shown in Figure 69; “selecting a portion of said image [and] entering destination data corresponding to said portion of said image” recited in claim 30 is shown in Figure 60; and claim 32 requires a selector for selecting a portion of said image” is also shown in Figure 69.

The Office Action asserts that selecting a portion of said image and entering destination data corresponding to said portion of said image is disclosed in Figure 69 and described at column 30, lines 20-21. Applicant disagrees with this interpretation of Enmei. In Enmei, Figure 69 merely shows a map with a highlighted point 553 representing a present location. Further, column 30 discloses selecting a coordinates on a map from which a trip can be planned or directions can be determined.

The Office Action includes Yoshioka, not to cure the deficiency discussed above but to disclose additional limitations which, even if it were to show these limitations, does not cure the deficiency discussed above. Yoshioka discloses a navigation device that allows a user to select a location from among a plurality of locations stored in the telephone number data base. The telephone number sets the destination for determining a map (similar to Enmei). However, Yoshioka and Enmei both fail to disclose Applicant’s explicitly claimed invention wherein a picture can be stored and various portions of the picture can be used to represent telephone numbers or other contact information. When the user seeks to dial one of the stored telephone numbers, the appropriate portion of the stored picture can be

selected and the telephone number will be dialed. Thus, whether taken alone or in combination, neither of the cited references discloses Applicant's claimed invention.

The remainder of the rejected claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the independent claims, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references and are also directed towards patentable subject matter. Thus, all of the pending claims should be allowed.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Application No.: 09/479,564

Docket No.: A3156.0013/P013

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: February 4, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas - 41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs